Appl. No. 10/597,960 Amdt. Dated July 24, 2009 Reply to Office action of July 6, 2009 Attorney Docket No. P19069-US1 EUS/GJ/P/09-6069

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 9, and 13; claims 6 and 14 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-8, 9-13 and 15-16 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koskiahde (WO 03/047183) in view of Veerapalli, et al. (US 2003/0153325) and further in view of Oda, et al. (US 2004/0005886). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and submits the following remarks for the Examiner's favorable reconsideration.

In the Advisory Action dated July 6, 2009, the Examiner further stated that Applicant's request for reconsideration had been considered but did not place the application in condition for allowance because the Examiner disagreed with the Applicant's argument that the Oda reference did not disclose the network control function entity to access and modify the decision data memory independently from the mobile station. In that regard, while referring to Figs. 4 and 5 of Oda, the Examiner further stated that "it is clear that the CPS is a separate and independent entity which is not embedded in the mobile terminal. Though the CPS is independent it must be connected to the mobile terminal in the network to receive the data from the mobile station for processing which includes the IP packet received which is similar to the decision data recited in the claim."

Applicant agrees with the Examiner's understanding of the Oda reference wherein the <u>CPS must be connected to the mobile terminal in order to receive the IP packet which may contain a decision data as recited in the present claim.</u> Applicant respectfully submits that the Oda reference is distinguishable from the present invention since the mobile terminal and the network control function entity maintain two separate

Appl. No. 10/597,960 Amdt. Dated July 24, 2009 Reply to Office action of July 6, 2009 Attorney Docket No. P19069-US1 EUS/GJ/P/09-6069

interfaces to the data management part in accordance with the teachings of the present invention and that there is no direct connection between the mobile terminal and the network control function entity. Applicant has now amended independent Claims 1 and 9 to more clearly and distinctly claim this difference from the Oda reference. More particularly, while referring to Fig. 8 of the present application as an illustration, the management part (43) as recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention has a first interface connecting the management part (43) with the decision data memory (42). The management part (43) has a second interface connecting the management part (43) with the mobile node (50) allowing the mobile node to modify the decision data over the first interface. Since the mobile node has the second interface to the management part, there is no need for the mobile node to communicate directly with the network control function entity. Lastly, the management part (43) has a third interface with the network control function entity (51) for allowing the network control function entity to also modify the decision data. As further recited in independent claim 1, the second interface and the third interface are two independent and separate interfaces to the management part.

Applicant therefore submits that Oda, independently or in combination with the other cited references, fails to anticipate or render obvious the presently pending independent claims. A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly requested.

Appl. No. 10/597,960 Amdt. Dated July 24, 2009 Reply to Office action of July 6, 2009 Attorney Docket No. P19069-US1 EUS/GJ/P/09-6069

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

<u>The Applicant requests a telephonic interview</u> if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/John C. Han, Reg#41403/

John C. Han Registration No. 41,403

Date: July 24, 2009

Ericsson Inc. 6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11 Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-7686 john.han@ericsson.com